

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending.

102 Rejections

Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobodzinski et al. ("Lobodzinski," US 5,734,873). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-54 is not anticipated or shown by Lobodzinski.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "a graphics controller coupled to the memory, the graphics controller accessing a font array of the data structure, the graphics controller comprising memory for holding information read from the font array" as recited in independent Claim 1 (emphasis added). In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "placing the information read from the font array in memory resident on a graphics controller" as recited in independent Claim 26 (emphasis added). Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest a system "wherein glyph information for a character to be rendered, said size width information and said size height information are read to registers of said graphics controller from said data structure" as recited in independent Claim 48 (emphasis added).

The Examiner is directed to Figure 2 of Lobodzinski and the accompanying discussion. Applicant respectfully notes that there is no showing or suggestion in Lobodzinski that graphics engine 48 places information read from character font

information 62 into memory resident on the graphics engine 48. Lobodzinski only describes registers 46 that are not resident on the graphics engine.

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner interprets the graphics controller of the claimed invention as the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski. Applicant respectfully notes that if the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski is interpreted as the graphics controller of the claimed invention, then the limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48 are not shown or suggested by Lobodzinski. As mentioned above, Lobodzinski does not show or suggest memory resident on a graphics controller. The Examiner makes reference to statements in Lobodzinski that describe registers associated with the text engine 52 of Lobodzinski. For example, column 4, lines 30-32, of Lobodzinski states "Registers associated with the text engine are described below." However, there is no showing or suggestion that any of these registers are resident on the graphics controller. The registers referred to by Lobodzinski can only be read as being the registers 46, which as mentioned above are not resident on the graphics engine 48.

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner interprets the graphics controller of the claimed invention as the display controller 30 of Lobodzinski. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation. The display controller 30 of Lobodzinski is shown as including the frame buffer 56. From Claims 2, 27 and 49, for example, it can be interpreted that the memory of the claimed graphics controller is different from a frame buffer. Therefore, the graphics controller of the claimed invention does not include a frame buffer. Thus, the Applicant

respectfully submits that the display controller of Lobodzinski is not equivalent to the claimed graphics controller.

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner interprets the font array as the array of index 412, font pointer 414, font pitch 415, x 416, y 418, size width 420 and size height 421 of Figure 4 of the instant application. Applicant respectfully notes that the font array recited in the claims is specifically "a font array of the data structure." The "font arrays of the data structure" are font arrays 460 and 462 of Figure 4 of the instant application, for example. Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement that "this array is resident on the graphics engine 48" of Lobodzinski. As mentioned above, Lobodzinski does not show or suggest memory resident on the graphics engine 48.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's basis for rejection of Claims 1, 26 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed, and that Claims 1, 26 and 48 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-25 are dependent on Claim 1; Claims 27-47 are dependent on Claim 26; and Claims 49-54 are dependent on Claim 48. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner's basis for rejection of Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is also traversed, as Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-54 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 7/23/03